REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 3 and 12 are amended herein. Claims 21 and 22 are newly added. Claims 1, 2, 10 and 11 have been canceled herein. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent 6,675,344. A terminal disclaimer filed in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) is submitted herewith. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-20 are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection based on the above noted non-statutory grounds.

102 Rejections

Claims 1, 6, 8-10, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thaller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,555,382). Amended Claims 3 and 12 include limitations contained in canceled Claims 1 and 10. The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in remaining rejected Claims 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Thaller et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 3 which sets forth an embodiment of the present invention that includes:

> ... an ECC encoder, the ECC encoder applying a first
> ECC code to a first portion of the transaction and a second
> ECC code to a second portion of the transaction; and a decoder

that decodes the first and the second ECC codes wherein the first portion of the transaction is a header packet and wherein the second portion of the transaction comprises one or more data packets.

Independent Claim 12 recites limitations similar to those contained in Claim 3. Claims 6, 8, 9 depend from Claim 3 and Claims 13, 14 and 16-18 depend from Claim 12 and set forth additional limitations of the claimed invention.

Thaller et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a multiple error code (ECC) mechanism for use with transactions in a computer system wherein a first portion of a "transaction is a header packet and wherein the second portion of the transaction comprises one or more data packets." Thaller et al. only discloses an intelligent snoopy bus arbiter. Moreover, Thaller et al. is concerned with arbitrating control of a bus in a multiprocessor system. However, Thaller et al. does not disclose data transactions that have first and second portions with first and second ECC codes applied to the first and second portions, where the first portion of a "transaction is a header packet and wherein the second portion of the transaction comprises one or more data packets" as is set forth in Claim 3 (Claim 12 contains similar limitations). Nowhere in the Thaller et al. reference are such limitations taught or suggested. Consequently, Thaller et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 3 and 12.

Because Thaller et al. does not anticipate the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 3 and 12, Claims 3 and 12 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 6, 8, 9 and 21 dependent on Claim 3, and Claims 13, 14, 16-18 and 22 dependent on Claim

12 likewise overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being dependent on an

allowable base claim and therefore are in condition for allowance.

New Claim 22 includes limitations contained in canceled Claim 11. New Claim 22

depends from independent Claim 12 and is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Thaller et

al. for the same reasons as enumerated for Claim 12 in the discussion above.

103 Rejections

Claims 2, 7, 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Thaller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,555,382). Amended Claims 3 and 12 include limitations

contained in canceled Claims 3 and 12. The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and

respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in

remaining rejected Claims 7 and 15 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Thaller et

al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 3 which sets forth an

embodiment of the present invention that includes:

> ... an ECC encoder, the ECC encoder applying a first
> ECC code to a first portion of the transaction and a second
> ECC code to a second portion of the transaction; and a decoder
> that decodes the first and the second ECC codes wherein the
> first portion of the transaction is a header packet and wherein
> the second portion of the transaction comprises one or more
> data packets.

New independent Claim 12 recites limitations similar to those contained in Claim 3.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 3 and Claim 15 depends from Claim 12 and sets forth additional

limitations of the claimed invention.

Thaller et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a multiple error code (ECC) mechanism for use with transactions in a computer system wherein a first portion of a "transaction is a header packet and wherein the second portion of the transaction comprises one or more data packets." Thaller et al. only discloses an intelligent snoopy bus arbiter. Moreover, Thaller et al. is concerned with arbitrating control of a bus in a multiprocessor system. However, Thaller et al. does not disclose data transactions that have first and second portions with first and second ECC codes applied to the first and second portions, where the first portion of a "transaction is a header packet and wherein the second portion of the transaction comprises one or more data packets" as is set forth in Claim 3 (Claim 12 contains similar limitations). Nowhere in the Thaller et al. reference are such limitations taught or suggested. Consequently, Thaller et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are recited in Claims 3 and 12.

Because Thaller et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 3 and 12, Claims 3 and 12 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 7 dependent on Claim 3, and Claim 15 dependent on Claim 12 likewise overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim and therefore are in condition for allowance.

New Claim 21 includes limitations contained in canceled Claim 2. New Claim 21 depends from independent Claim 3 and is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Thaller et al. for the same reasons as enumerated for Claim 3 in the discussion above.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: __/ 5/__, 2005

John P. Wagner
Registration No. 35,398
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060